



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing the property he must take the wife. This would have interfered with his inheritance, so that he demurred. How came he to recognize the redemption as a duty, had there not been the obligation of law in it?

Thus it is that the short history of the book before us gives its evidence to the existence both of a Levitical and a Deuteronomic code previous to the later quarter of the 14th century before Christ. It is but confirmatory; for the whole Bible, both Old and New Testaments, bears evidence to the truth of the traditional belief of the Church in regard to its first books. It is little enough to say that some regard should be paid to the almost unanimous consent of the most diligent students of the Word of God in all ages; and that charges of ignorance should be withheld until "new" suppositions have an approximately unanimous consent.

➤GENERAL NOTES.◀

The Aramæan Portion of Daniel, a translation.—Of the Book of *Daniel* the first chapter is written in Hebrew, together with three and a half verses of the second chapter; then everything is in Aramæan till the end of the seventh chapter; after which the Hebrew recurs to the close of the twelfth and last chapter. We are instantly forced to ask the question, Why this alternation? The subject matter does not explain it. It is not a distinction between historical and prophetic, for of the six historical chapters one is Hebrew and five Aramæan, and of the six prophetic chapters one is Aramæan and five Hebrew. It is possible that two or three different authors who composed in different languages have been put together by an editor, but this is not probable; for the first chapter, in Hebrew, is a natural introduction for what follows in Aramæan, and the break between the two occurs in the middle of a story. I prefer, then, with Lenormant, to hold that the whole book was originally written in Hebrew, and that it was afterwards translated into Aramæan. At a later period the Hebrew of the six chapters following the first was lost, and the editor put the Aramæan in its place. We thus have a book composed in part of its original Hebrew, and in part of the Aramæan translation, or targum, of the original which has been lost. It is incredible that any single writer would have purposely composed a single book in two languages. If, however, when it was adopted at a very late period, as we know, into the canon, the editor, or scribe, or Sanhedrim was unable to find the entire Hebrew, it would have been natural to put the equally familiar Aramæan in its place, and thus complete the book. The Gospel of *Matthew* is another example of a book originally written in one language but presently lost in that language, and finally current only in a translation.

Besides, this theory explains satisfactorily the difficulties, otherwise not easily surmountable, which rationalistic writers bring against the historical character of *Daniel*. Chief among these is the use of Greek words, which could not have been

in vogue much before the time of Alexander and the Macedonian invasion. Of the six kinds of musical instruments, translated "cornet, flute, harp, sackbutt, psaltery, and dulcimer," in the story of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, four are pure Greek; and at the time of Daniel, Greek had not at all invaded the East: it was still an Ionian language. But if the Aramæan is a translation of an early Hebrew text, we escape the difficulty entirely of which so much has been made. Indeed, there is a pretty plain indication in the text that we have to do with a translation. Thus, where the transition comes from the Hebrew to the Aramæan we read, "Then the Chaldeans said unto the king in Aramean," as it is generally translated. But the word 'Aramæan' is a parenthesis to indicate that we now pass to a passage in that language: it should be read, "And the Chaldeans said to the king, [Aramæan text] O King, live for ever." The fact is that the Chaldeans did not speak in Aramæan (or 'Syriac' as our version has it), but in Assyrian, a wholly different language, and the current version makes a serious difficulty which we avoid if we understand that the Aramæan is a later version. We find the same word 'Aramæan' employed to introduce a passage in that language in *Ezra*, where the received version says of the adversaries of the Jews who wrote to Cyrus: "The writing of the letter was in the Syrian tongue and interpreted in the Syrian tongue"—which makes pure nonsense. The translation must have been in Persian; and we should read, with the gloss in parenthesis: "And in the days of Artaxerxes, wrote Bishlam, Mithredates, Tabeel, and the rest of his companions unto Artaxerxes, King of Persia; and the text of the letter was written in Aramæan and accompanied by a translation, [Aramæan text]"—the letter following in Aramæan, as stated.

The Aramæan portion of *Daniel* being a translation has the same faults of translation that the Septuagint has, some of which are easily corrected. Thus, we have Nebuchadnezzar for Nebuchadrezzar, Abednego for Abednebo (servant of Nebo), Belshazzar for Belsharazzar, and very likely Meshach for Mesha-Marduk. There are some copyists' errors in the Hebrew as well as in the Aramæan chapters, one of which, in ch. II., 1, makes Daniel in the *second* year of Nebuchadnezzar, before he had time fairly to get into the Chaldean school as a boy, to be already a learned interpreter of dreams.

We may add to this the error in ch. IX., 1, where Ahasuerus is put for Cyaxares. The sacred text is no more kept miraculously free from such copyists' errors than are the works of classical writers. No one would think of making the copyists' blunders in Herodotus an argument against its authenticity. No more should such an error be made an argument against Scripture, certainly not against the Book of *Daniel* which came very late into the canon, as its place in the Hebrew Scriptures indicates.—*William H. Ward, D. D., in the Journal of Christian Philosophy.*

The Occurrence of the Divine Names in Genesis.—In the fourth and fifth chapters of Genesis there is a fair occasion for testing the theory that by the use of one or other of the divine names one can trace the separate authorship of the component parts of the first book of the Bible.

In the fourth chapter we find the name Lord used throughout with one signal exception. This occurs in the twenty-fifth verse, where Eve says: "For God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel." In the fifth exactly the reverse is seen. Here the name God is used throughout with one signal exception. This is